

INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY LAW

VOLUME FOUR

PATENTS AND INTEGRATED

CIRCUIT TOPOGRAPHY

Spring 1990
Professor Rosemary J. Coombe*

These materials are solely for the classroom use of students at the Faculty of Law, University of Toronto.

*The assistance of Ms. Eileen McMahon of Blake, Cassels & Graydon, Dr. Patricia Rae of Sim, Hughes, Dimock, and Mrs. Colleen Spring-Zimmerman of Fasken, Campbell, Godfrey is gratefully acknowledged.

LAW LIBRARY

MAR 26 1990

FACULTY OF LAW
UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO

FACULTY OF LAW LIBRARY
UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO

INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY LAW

VOLUME FOUR


PATENTS AND INTEGRATED

CIRCUIT TOPOGRAPHY

Spring 1990
Professor Rosemary J. Coombe*

These materials are solely for the classroom use of students at the Faculty of Law, University of Toronto.

*The assistance of Ms. Eileen McMahon of Blake, Cassels & Graydon, Dr. Patricia Rae of Sim, Hughes, Dimock, and Mrs. Colleen Spring-Zimmerman of Fasken, Campbell, Godfrey is gratefully acknowledged.



Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2018 with funding from
University of Toronto

<https://archive.org/details/intellectualprop04coom>

5. PATENTS

A.	<u>HISTORY, POLICY INTERESTS, AND PROCEDURE</u>	<u>Page</u>
	Ross, "Beyond the Better Mousetrap: An Introduction to Patents" (1989)	1
	"Modernization of Canada's Patent Act" (Consumer and Corporate Affairs Canada, November 1989)	23
	"News Release: Canada Ratifies International Patent Cooperation Treaty" (Consumer and Corporate Affairs, October 2, 1989).	31
B.	<u>CRITERIA FOR PATENTABILITY</u>	
I	<u>SUBJECT MATTER</u>	
	i) <u>Unpatentable Matter</u>	
	In the Matter of Cooper's Application	32
	In the Matter of Fishburn's Application	34
	ii) <u>Section 27(3) Prohibitions</u> [See also materials on the Patenting of Life Forms]	36
II	<u>THE QUALITY OF INVENTION</u>	
	i) <u>Section 2 Definition</u>	
	Comment	37
	ii) <u>Inventive Ingenuity or "Unobviousness"</u>	
	Lowe-Martin Co. v. Office Specialty	38
	Application of Menendez	42
	Hercules v. Commissioner of Patents	42
	Hughes, "Degree of Inventiveness Required to Support a Patent Application (1987)	43
	Roberts, "Note: Inventive Ingenuity"	46
	Cabot Corp. v. 318602 Ontario	48

III NOVELTY

Comment 60

Statutory Provisions: Patent Act s. 27, 27.1, 28 60

Comment:

i) Anticipation: Prior Application 64

ii) Anticipation: Prior Disclosure

a) Described in Previous Publication 64

Beloit Canada Ltd. v. Valmet 66

Cluett, Peabody and Co. v. Dominion Textile 69

Saunders v. Airglide Deflectors Ltd. 70

b) Previous Public Use or Sale

Leitheiser v. Pengo Hydra-Pull 71

c) Exception for Experiment or Amusement

Canadian Patent Scaffolding v.
Delzotto Enterprises 72

iii) Anticipation: Prior Knowledge

Comment 79

Proctor & Gamble Co. v. Bristol Myers 80

Morrissey, "A Flow Chart of the Novelty Provisions
of the Canadian Patent Act" (1990) 81

IV UTILITY

Hammond, "Inutility Attacks on Canadian Patents" (1985) 85

C. INFRINGEMENT

I ACTS CONSTITUTING INFRINGEMENT

i) Use or Sale Within Canada 92

ii) Importing or Exporting 92

iii) <u>Transporting</u>	92
iv) <u>Resale</u>	92
v) <u>Inducing Infringement</u>	
Slater Steel Industries v. R. Payor Co.	93
vi) <u>Reconstruction vs Repair</u>	107
vii) <u>Equivalency</u>	108
II <u>ACTS NOT CONSTITUTING INFRINGEMENT</u>	109
III <u>DEFENCES</u>	
AT & T Technologies v. Mitel Corporation	110
 D. <u>BIOTECHNOLOGY: PATENTING LIFEFORMS</u>	
I <u>STATUTORY PROVISIONS</u>	
Patent Act s.2, 27,34,39	
Manual of Patent Office Practice Requirements	128
Draft Provisions	130
II <u>CASE LAW</u>	
Diamond v. Chakrabarty	132
Re Application of Abitibi Co.	136
Pioneer Hi-Bred Ltd. v. Commissioner of Patents (FCA)	142
Pioneer Hi-Bred v. Commissioner of Patents (SCC)	145
American Cyanamid v. Charles E. Frosst	153
United States Patent No. 4,736,866	157
III <u>STATUTORY PROPOSALS</u>	
Bill C-15, "An Act Respecting Plant Breeder's Rights" (1989)	165

E. PATENTS & PHARMACEUTICAL LICENSING

I STATUTORY PROVISIONS

Patent Act s.39 - s.39.26

II CASE LAW: INVENTIONS INTENDED FOR FOOD OR MEDICINE

Parke Davis & Co. v. Fine Chemicals of Canada Ltd. 174

Imperial Chemical Industries v. Commissioner
of Patents 180

Willow Creek Laboratories v. C.S.I.R.O. 183

R. v. Hoffmann - La Roche Ltd. 191

III COMPULSORY LICENSING

Hoffmann - La Roche Ltd. v. Frank W. Horner Ltd.

American Home Products Corp. v. ICN Canada Ltd. 216
(FCA; leave to appeal refused)

American Home Products Corp. v. ICN Canada Ltd. (FCA) 222

Smith, Kline & French Laboratories v. 230
A.G. of Canada (FCA; leave to appeal refused)

IV SECTION 39 AMENDMENTS

Imperial Chemical Industries v. Apotex (FCTD) 231

Imperial Chemical Industries v. Apotex (FCA) 242

V METHODS OF MEDICAL TREATMENT

Tennessee Eastman Co. v. Commissioner of Patents 253

Imperial Chemical Industries v. Commissioner of Patents 270

Reapplication of Patent of Wayne State University 272

Hoffman-La Roche Ltd. v. Apotex Inc. 275

VI REPORT OF THE (EASTMAN) COMMISSION INQUIRY
ON THE PHARMACEUTICAL INDUSTRY

Recommendations and Briefs submitted to the Commission from the 1964 Hall Commission on Health Services, the 1967 Hall Committee on Drug Costs, the Combines Investigation Branch, Department of Consumer and Corporate Affairs 1983, Pharmaceutical Manufacturers Association 1984, and the Canadian Drug Manufacturers Association, 1984.
[on reserve at library]

Excerpts from Eastman Commission Report (1985) 282

6. INTEGRATED CIRCUIT TOPOGRAPHY

A. STATUTORY DEVELOPMENTS

News Release (Consumer and Corporate Affairs, December 18, 1989) 302

Bill C-57: Integrated Circuit Topography Act 304

